



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,000	12/03/2001	Mithra M.K.V. Sankrithi	38190/235693	2953

826 7590 10/20/2004

ALSTON & BIRD LLP
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER

CROW, STEPHEN R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3764

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/006,000	SANKRITHI, MITHRA M.K.V.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steve R. Crow	3764	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-20 and 22-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-20, 22-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5,7-9,12,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moller in view of Coody et al.
3. Moller discloses a treadmill device comprising a treadmill track which is pivotally mounted to a wall for enabling it to be moved between a stowed and a deployed position.

Coody et al discloses a treadmill and seat combination comprising a treadmill track 10 capable of being moved between a stowed position and a deployed position, a foldable seat 200-204 connected to the treadmill track for enabling a person to sit thereon when the treadmill track is stored in the stowed position.

In view of the Coody combinational teaching of a folding seat for a treadmill, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to employ a foldable seat underneath the Moller treadmill or additional exercise purposes or for providing a seating structure, while still retaining the desired compactibility taught by Moller and Coody et al.

Art Unit: 3764

Additionally, with respect to claim 4, the examiner contends that the Coody et al device can accommodate two small children side by side. Furthermore, changes in size are generally considered as design choices, and the examiner contends it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to enlarge the Coody cushion to accommodate larger sized users, and thereby accommodating two adults.

As to claims 7, 9, modern conventional treadmills utilize a motor, belt and control means, as exemplified by Coody et al, and would therefore have been obvious to one skilled in the art to apply in the Moller treadmill for better variability of treadmill speeds.

As to claim 8, note user support 50.

1. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moller in view of Coody et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Anderson.

Anderson teaches the use of safety restraints such as seat belt 29 for restraining a person on a seat. (A quick search in the exercise area will show dozens of similar type restraining means). In view of this teaching, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the Moller, modified supra device by incorporating a seat belt for safety purposes.

4. Claims 15-20,22-24,27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moller in view of Coody et al and Anderson.

Art Unit: 3764

5. Moller discloses a treadmill device comprising a treadmill track which is pivotally mounted to a wall for enabling it to be moved between a stowed and a deployed position.

Coody et al discloses a treadmill and seat combination comprising a treadmill track 10 capable of being moved between a stowed position and a deployed position, a foldable seat 200-204 connected to the treadmill track for enabling a person to sit thereon when the treadmill track is stored in the stowed position.

In view of the Coody combinational teaching of a folding seat for a treadmill, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to employ a foldable seat underneath the Moller treadmill or additional exercise purposes or for providing a seating structure, while still retaining the desired compactibility taught by Moller and Coody et al.

Additionally, with respect to claim 4, the examiner contends that the Coody et al device can accommodate two small children side by side. Furthermore, changes in size are generally considered as design choices, and the examiner contends it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to enlarge the Coody cushion to accommodate larger sized users, and thereby accommodating two adults.

As to claims 7, 9, modern conventional treadmills utilize a motor, belt and control means, as exemplified by Coody et al, and would therefore have been obvious to one skilled in the art to apply in the Moller treadmill for better variability of treadmill speeds.

Art Unit: 3764

Anderson teaches the use of safety restraints such as seat belt 29 for restraining a person on a seat. (A quick search in the exercise area will show dozens of similar type restraining means). In view of this teaching, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the Moller , modified supra device by incorporating a seat belt for safety purposes.

As stated previously, the claims recite a hypothetical future event which carries no patentable weight. Claim 15+ do not positively recite airplane structure, and therefore, the examiner contends that the claims are to be interpreted as structurally limited to the seating and treadmill exercise device.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). **The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claimed floor attachment means; payment means; and time limit means must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.**

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet,

Art Unit: 3764

and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1-13,25-26,29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

8. Claims 1 and 29 recite a securing device for firmly attaching to a floor. This structure is not shown in the Drawings. It is unclear how and where the structure stated

Art Unit: 3764

in the Specification is structurally employed in connecting the treadmill to the floor surface .

9. Claims 10,11,25-26 recite means for accepting payment ; and recite means for limiting the time . These structures lack support in the Drawings.Because these elements are not properly shown in the Drawings, it is unclear how and where the claimed structure is incorporated into the treadmill device.

Claim Objections


3. Claim 17 objected to because of the following informalities: Line 2 recites "on". Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13,15-20,22-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steve R Crow whose telephone number is 703-308-3398. The examiner can normally be reached on Reg:8:30-6;Off First Friday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 703-308-2698. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


STEPHEN R. CROW
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 332

Art Unit: 3764

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SC



STEPHEN R. CROW
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 332